



Serial No. 08/447,974
Atty. Docket No. 05634.0145

27/leg for
Reconsid
8-4-01
NP

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

John C. Harvey and James W. Cuddihy:

Group Art Unit: 2699

Serial No.: 08/447,974

Examiner: Luther, W.

Filed: May 23, 1995

Attorney Docket: 05634.0145

For: **SIGNAL PROCESSING APPARATUS
AND METHODS**

RECEIVED
AUG 24 2001
Technology Center 2600

Box: Fee-Amendment

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Hon. Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

The paper is responsive to the Office communication mailed on March 21, 2001 (March '01 Communication) by the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO). The March '01 Communication provides a one month period for response that may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). This response is timely filed with a petition for an extension of time submitted herewith.

The March '01 Communication asserts that the reply filed on April 13, 2000 Response is not fully responsive to the prior Office action issued on February 3, 1998 Action. The March '01 Communication asserts that the reply failed to sufficiently supplement the allegedly deficient August 3, 1998 Response(s), which, in turn, allegedly failed to comply with the Administrative Requirement (described in detail below) contained in the February 3, 1998 Action.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the determination in the March '01 Communication that applicants' prior filings were non-responsive so that substantive examination on the merits of the instant application can resume.

First, applicants respectfully maintain that the April 13, 2000 Response and the August 3, 1998 Response each fully complied with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 because